

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and consideration of the present claims in light of the following remarks.

First, the Examiner objected to the drawings for the inclusion of the extraneous terminology "ERSATZBLATT (REGEL 26)" and reference characters 32-50 which are not mentioned in the specification. As set forth above, proposed corrections to the drawings are shown in red on the attached sheets, which applicant believes place the drawings into allowable form. Applicant will provide formal drawings showing the proposed corrections upon the finding of allowability, prior to payment of the issue fee.

Next the Examiner raised objection to the specification for failing to provide a brief description of Figures 2a to 2c and 13-15 or the proper section headings. Additionally, the specification was objected to on the grounds that the sentence bridging pages 16 and 17 and the sentences bridging pages 17 and 18 were not understood.

In response, applicant has amended the specification to include a brief description of Figures 2a to 2c and 13-15 and the proper section headings. Notwithstanding, applicant believes that the sentences bridging pages 16 and 17 and pages 17 and 18 are complete. In this regard, the quotations from the Office Action appear to indicate that the Examiner has merely missed the last line on each of pages 16 and 17.

More particularly, the sentence bridging pages 16 and 17 reads, "Here too, the degree of reduction in luminance attained by reflector 8 depends on the relation between the reflective area and the transmissive area and the hole size." (The last line of page 16 shown in italics.) Similarly, the last full sentence on page 17 and the sentence bridging pages 17 and 18 read as follows, "Thus, the light beams in the light emitted or reflected upward which are scattered at covering 22 bring about a uniform indirect illumination of the room which is pleasant for the observer. The two points at which the two sheathed cables 20 exit lamp 24 define an axis 23 running parallel to the two gaps 7." (The last line of page 17 shown in italics.)

Applicant believes that the specification is clear when read with the last line in each of the pages 16 and 17, and no amendment is therefore required. In an effort to

further illustrate the last lines of the subject pages, applicant includes copies of pages 16 and 17 of the translation as filed and respectfully requests removal of the objection to the specification.

The Examiner next objected to Claims 2-12 of the application based on several formal grounds. Applicant has amended the claims with these objections in mind and believes that each of the items raised by the Examiner have been corrected in the above amendments. Removal of the objection is therefore requested.

Turning to the substantive matters contained in the Office Action, Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Williams et al. and Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bedel. However, the Examiner stated that Claims 2-8, 10 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the formal objections and include the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In keeping, applicant has corrected the formal matters, as set forth above, and has further amended Claim 1 to include the subject matter of Claim 2, thereby placing Claim 1 into proper form for allowance. Additionally, since each of the remaining pending claims ultimately depend from Claim 1, all of the remaining claims are also believed to be in proper form for allowance.

Based on the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in proper form for allowance. Favorable consideration and the indication of allowability of all claims is therefore respectfully requested and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth F. Florek  
Reg. No. 33,173

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989